

Matthew-Lane: Hassell, Agent
45 Falcon Crest Way
Manchester, New Hampshire [03104]
(603)231-0844

5th of April, 2023

In the Matter of: Matthew-Lane: Hassell and Devin Kimbark
656-2022-DM-00737

Matthew-Lane: Hassell authorized agent of)	
MATTHEW LANE HASSELL)	
Petitioner)	
)	CASE NO.: 656-2002-DM-00737
VS.-)	10th Circuit- Family Division- Derry
)	
Devin Aileen Kimbark)	
Attorney Jennifer L. DiTrapano)	
Respondent)	
)	
)	
)	

MOTION for OBJECTION to ORDERS from 22nd of March, 2023:

I object to all Orders set forth in this matter on 22nd of March, 2023:

1. I demand an Evidentiary Hearing to establish Final Orders with due process of law.
2. I have been denied due process of law by these orders coming down before an Evidentiary Hearing or Trial.
3. Attorney DiTrapano has produced no evidence to support her claims and lies, by an incompetent client, by hearsay, that's on record.
4. Attorney DiTrapano has lied about me with no proof to her claims and slandered my good name. These lies have been made to the court, to your honor and on the record for the record in court on March 22nd, 2023, one such lie is, I have no family in New Hampshire. An Evidentiary Hearing will bring proof to this lie and several others, which is a lie depriving Phoenix Hassell and myself from one another and equal protection under the law.
5. The court's own paperwork states on the Parenting Plan (page 1 of 9) that children do best when BOTH parents have a stable and meaningful involvement in their life, do you not agree, your honor?
6. How can a person of unsound mind (Devin Kimbark), with only claims of hearsay by Attorney DiTrapano have sole decision making of a child, when that person can not make their own decisions?
7. I object to supervised visits as there has been no evidence presented that I am a danger to Phoenix Hassell or anyone for that matter, I will accept nothing less than equal 50/50 custodial rights.

8. Child support is unconstitutional and deprives me of equal protection. If Devin Kimbark can not support herself and our child, then Devin Kimbark should not have primary physical custody and perhaps only weekend visitation instead.
9. I should not have to pay a bribe or ransom, to hearsay claims, by Attorney DiTrapano, without proof, through due process of law, to be able to see our child.
10. I have no contract with Attorney DiTrapano and therefore, there is no obligation for me to pay fees which are enforceable. Devin Kimbark, hired Attorney DiTrapano, she alone is responsible for all fees accrued, not me, in any way. This is a previously established custom by attorneys who did not properly represent their client and another reason why I don't want an attorney.
11. There is no articulate and competent reason, supported by evidence, that a competent individual such as myself, to be denied equal custodial rights and to be watched, like a prisoner, to be able to see our child.
12. Medical costs are equal responsibilities and therefore should be paid equally, providing I was being treated with equal protection under the law, which is constitutionally protected.
13. How can our child be in Devin Kimbark's care when Devin Kimbark is in her parents' care?
14. Even the respondents' attorney needs clarification as to the judges' orders, which gives further grounds to my objections to the judges' orders and more weight to the need for an Evidentiary Hearing.
15. It is my understanding that judges cannot make prejudiced decisions, so until something is entered into evidence, the judge lacks judicial power.
16. No matter what the judge thinks of me, I'm clearly the more responsible parent, as I provide and have provided a living domicile without my family supporting me, as a competent adult individual should be able to do.
17. I object to contracting to drug testing, there is no reasoning behind me having the invasion of privacy, of being forced to drug testing, other than through hearsay from Devin Kimbark through her attorney once again, proving my claims that she slanders and she libels me, without any proof.
18. The fact Attorney DiTrapano is opposing an Evidentiary Hearing seems to be evidence, prima facie evidence that her client is afraid of the facts and truths coming out. They can not stop the truth.
19. I have been denied an evidentiary hearing, due process of law and constitutional equal protection rights under the law. This is grounds for mistrial.
20. Matthew sayeth not.
21. VOID WHERE PROHIBITED BY LAW.

NEW HAMPSHIRE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE,
PARENS PATRIAE DOCTRINE

I certify that I have sent this to respondents representative Attorney DiTrapano by email.

Matthew-Lane: Hassell authorized agent of
MATTHEW LANE HASSELL
45 Falcon Crest Way
Manchester, New Hampshire [03104]

Date: _____